OGC Has Reviewed For Release 2001/09/03 : CIA-RDP84-00709R000490070099-4

Reschilve Ragistry

Chior,

25 April 1049

25X1A

Office of the General Counsel

Harriago of Forsonnol

Your sectorendum of 30 Barch 1949 requests an opinion in regard to cortain questions which are implicit in the enforcement of subject General Administrative Instructions

dated 13 January 1949, requires all 2. employees at oversess posts who are centerplating marriage to a person of "foreign nationality, family, background, or connections", to obtain the permission of headquarters prior to taking the final stop. Pailure to obtain such permission results in automatic termination. For administrative convenience, the employee is also required to subsit his FOIAb5 resignation at the time permission is requested. Security, of course, is the reason for such official scruting.

OIAb5

- 3. It is assembly that the individual contracts signed by each employee do not contain any specific clause prohibiting marriage, for reasons of security, without the approval of the Monor.
- d. In the first situation you have specified, where an employee resigns after permission to marry is denied by headquartors, we believe that a breach of contract has common through the voluntary action of the employee. is true even though the employee is required by the instruction to subsit his resignation in order to obtain permission, and find action on the resignation depends ontirely upon an administrative decision. If the employee fails to stek portionion to marry and is terrimeted in compliance with the provisions of the instruction, termination is the direct consequence of an act which is within his control and is tierefore also a breach of contract. If the contract contains an express admondedgement of a debt to the Govern mont who never terrination results for reasons other than those beyond his control, the financial rights and obligations of the employee are clearly shipulated. Once the broud: of contract is established, the employee is obligated to the Government for the expense of original travel obligated through either express contractual asknowledgements or the operation of P.L. 600. This is true, of course, only in beson where the breach occurs prior to the completion of twolve. munths duty. Your second question is answered accordingly.

Ention imposed by law and terms of the contract only maceralty overcome the legal requirements. In specific moment to your third question, under present regulations no one but the Director can grant such a waiver.

You have questioned the general propriety of ratating a broach of contract or effecting a termination an the result of marginge. It is bolioved that our particular problem does not mall within the scope of those mutters which are generally considered destrary to public policy's The basic quantion of scourtly is fundamental, to the existence of this Agency, Spunded as It is on broad provinions for mational defound and the gomeral malgare, so that reasonable regulations for the production of that sooutty should not be ambject to objection. The Redillar outright probibition against curriage applied by the Government in the case of West Point cadets and Amapolis midshippon has not as for as prohibition against marriage based on security would lave even greater funtification. Our regulation is not their countries and is not directed against marriago as an institution, or to a claus, but only to specific individuals. Por those reasons, we do not believe that this aspect of the problem presents my cause for concern.

7. Due foregoing is a general statement to establish on approach to this problem. As a great wordety of cases, we would be pleased to assist with any specific cases presented.

Constal Counsel

LRH/1111

subject
Legal Decisions
Route one to:

STÄTINTL

1/09/03 : CIA-RDP84-00709R000400070099-4

Appr